## Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEANNIE ATIENZA, et al., Plaintiffs,

v.

ANDREW HALL, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. <u>19-cv-03440-RS</u>

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

In June 2019, Plaintiff Jeannie Atienza, individually and as a successor-in-interest to Laudemer Arboleda, filed this federal civil rights action against Defendants, including Officer Andrew Hall. On August 4, 2021, Officer Hall's motion for summary judgment was denied. Officer Hall now moves for leave to file a motion for reconsideration under Civil L.R. 7-9(b)(1).

A party who wishes to move for reconsideration of an interlocutory order must first seek leave to file such a motion under Civil L.R. 7-9. Under Civil L.R. 7-9(b)(1), the party must show that "a material difference in fact or law exists from that which was presented to the Court before entry of the interlocutory order for which reconsideration is sought" and that "in the exercise of reasonable diligence the party applying for reconsideration did not know such fact or law at the time of the interlocutory order."

Officer Hall has not satisfied the Civil L.R. 7-9(b)(1) requirements. Officer Hall argues that Earl v. Campbell, \_\_ F. App'x \_\_, 2021 U.S. App. LEXIS 16268 (9th Cir. June 1, 2021), and the subsequent denial of the Earl plaintiff's petition for rehearing en banc, represent a material

## Case 3:19-cv-03440-RS Document 118 Filed 09/15/21 Page 2 of 2

	2
	2 3 4
	4
	5
	6
	5 6 7 8
	8
	9 10
	10
	11
	11 12
	13
	14
	15
	16 17 18
	17
	18
	19 20
	20
	21
	22
	23
	24
	25
	26
	27
	28

United States District Court

1

change in the law. Earl is an unpublished Ninth Circuit memorandum disposition, filed on June 1,
2021, nearly two months before the oral arguments on the motion for summary judgment. This
unpublished decision, applying settled law to the facts unique to that case, is not a basis for
granting leave to seek reconsideration. Further, Officer Hall has not shown reasonable diligence in
bringing Earl to the court's attention. Accordingly, the motion for leave to seek reconsideration is
denied.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 15, 2021

RICHARD SEEBORG Chief United States District Judge